REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 13 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Arnold Patent No. US 6,175,924 B1 (hereinafter Arnold).

Regarding the amended claim 1, Arnold does not disclose that if there is no space area for downloading or installing data in the first memory, arbitrary data which is accumulated in the first memory and possible to be saved is saved to the second memory, and that the saved data is restored in the first memory when there is space area available in the first memory. The Office Action states that Arnold teaches the above saving and restoring processes. However, Arnold's process of deleting the application programs from memory when they are no longer needed, and then reloading them at a later time when their services are again required (Arnold; column 1, lines 65-67) is different from the invention of the amended claim 1 which requires saving and restoring data based on whether there is space in the first memory. According to the invention of the amended claim 1, the data is not deleted, but transferred from the first memory to the second

memory and saved in the second memory. Arnold discloses that the data is persistent in computer memory (Arnold; column 1, line 63). This disclosure directly contradicts the invention of the amended claim 1 that requires the transfer of data from the first memory to the second memory if there is no space area for the data. Also, Arnold's process of allocation of addresses within memory 107 to an application program (Arnold; column 4, lines 63-65) is different from the invention of the amended claim 1 that requires the transfer of data from the first memory to the second memory if there is no space area for the data. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 1 is not taught by the reference, claim 1 is not fully anticipated by Arnold. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 and 17 which are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

In addition, regarding claim 13, Arnold does not disclose that if there is no space area for downloading or installing data in the first memory when an instruction to download or install the application program in the first memory is received, arbitrary data which is accumulated in the first memory and possible to be saved is saved to the second memory. There is no disclosure in Arnold that data is transferred from the first memory to the second memory, when an instruction to download or install the application program in the first memory is received.

Regarding claim 14, Arnold does not disclose that specific saved data is restored in accordance with a restoration instruction from the electronic device. Arnold's reloading process, which is made when their services are again required, is different from the invention of claim 14 that requires the restoration of data in accordance with a restoration instruction from the electronic device.

Regarding claim 15, Arnold does not disclose that the saved data related to the application program is restored in accordance with a start instruction of the application program from the electronic device. Arnold's reloading process, which is made when their services are again required, is different from the invention of claim 15 that requires the restoration of data related to the application program in accordance with a start instruction of the application program from the electronic device.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-36462.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: _____
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 2, 2008